DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 157 SP 003 949

AUTHOR Bouchard, John B.; Hull, Ronald E.
TITLE A Pilot Study of Problems and Practices in the Induction of Beginning Teachers.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Fredonia. Coll. at Fredonia.
PUB DATE Jan 70
NOTE 43p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.25
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers, *Course Evaluation, Evaluation Methods, Inservice Teacher Education, Preservice Education, *Question Answer Interviews, *Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

A pilot study was designed to test the practicality of gathering data through interviews and to provide tentative information on induction problems and practices encountered by beginning teachers in the Cattaraugus-Chautauqua County area of New York. Fifty-three elementary self-contained classroom teachers and secondary academic subject-matter teachers, with 19 principals of elementary, secondary, and comprehensive schools, comprised the sample population. The interviews were designed with forced-choice and open-ended questions to discover what help the beginning teachers received and what induction programs existed in the schools. The beginning teachers were asked how helpful their methods courses, teaching practice and non-educational courses were as preparation for teaching. A majority found their preservice training irrelevant, experienced initial difficulties in the school and would have preferred greater definition of their roles, although they were grateful for the help they did receive and planned to continue teaching. Principals recognized the need for better induction programs but in many cases lacked the time to develop them. Separate studies are recommended to investigate the discrepancies between the teachers' and principals' evaluation of the induction programs and to increase the effectiveness of the methodology. Appendixes A and B give summaries of the teachers' and principals' interview data and Appendix C compares the sample groups with population on selected data categories. (MBM)

ED040157

JUN 26 1970

A PILOT STUDY OF PROBLEMS AND PRACTICES IN THE INDUCTION OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

JOHN B. BOUCHARD AND RONALD E. HULL

TEACHER EDUCATION RESEARCH CENTER

STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

FREDONIA, NEW YORK

SP 003949

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED0 40157

A PILOT STUDY OF PROBLEMS AND PRACTICES IN THE INDUCTION OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

JOHN B. BOUCHARD AND RONALD E. HULL

January 1970

FOREWORD

This study, A PILOT STUDY OF PROBLEMS AND PRACTICES IN THE INDUCTION OF BEGINNING TEACHERS, was conducted by the Teacher Education Research Center, SUNY College at Fredonia, in cooperation with the Southwestern New York Association for the Improvement of Instruction.

The purposes of the study were to test the practicality of the interview procedure of data gathering and to provide some tentative information on induction problems and practices encountered by beginning teachers in the Cattaraugus-Chautauqua County area. The interview method, as such, was demonstrated to be an effective means to obtaining in-depth information with regard to induction problems of beginning teachers. However, the incongruence between teachers' perceptions of the help they received and principals' responses concerning their schools' induction programs pointed out the need for a separate study of supervisory practices in the schools.

The text of the report is concerned both with the study of the methodological procedures and the interpretation of the findings. Appendix A and B contain complete summaries of the interview data; Appendix C illustrates sample-population comparisons. The study has fulfilled its major purposes and has provided the investigators with initial base line data upon which to plan the continuing study of the teacher induction process.

Kenneth G. Nelson, Director
Teacher Education Research Center
SUNY College, Fredonia

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge with thanks the assistance and cooperation provided by officers and members of the SWNY Association for the Improvement of Instruction:

President - Louis DiGirolamo, Supervising Principal of the Ellicottville Central Schools, Ellicottville, New York.

Vice President - Samuel Danton, Supervising Principal of the Cassadaga Valley Central Schools.

Executive Secretary-Treasurer-John B. Bouchard, Professor of Education, State University College at Fredonia.

Association Advisory Committee:

Caroline Cash, Curriculum Director, Olean Public Schools.

Ralph Marra, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, Southwestern Central Schools.

Kenneth Christner, Supervising Principal, Pine Valley Central Schools.

James Cross, Assistant District Superintendent, Cattaraugus Sole Supervisory School District.

Our thanks is also due to the following Interviewers:

Rose Mary Arcoraci
Barbara A. Davey
Mary Ann Ellis
Carmen Gilman
John Helfeldt
Patricia McQuiston
Nan Salerno
Winifred Shepard
Georgene Weinel

The authors also wish to express their appreciation for the assistance of Kenneth G. Nelson, Alice S. Hilton and J. Brien Murphy in planning and carrying out the study.

COOPERATING SCHOOLS

Cattaraugus County

Allegany Central, Charles Holowach, Supervising Principal

Cattaraugus Central, Guy Mathews, Supervising Principal

Ellicottville Central, Louis DiGirolamo, Supervising Principal

Franklinville Central, Gary W. Barr, Supervising Principal

Gowanda Central, Lawrence T. Scura, Supervising Principal

Hinsdale Central, James B. Johnson, Supervising Principal

Limestone Central, John Pionzio, Supervising Principal

Little Valley Central, Arthur Memmott, Supervising Principal

Olean Public Schools, Harold McManus, Superintendent of Schools

Portville Central, Lee A. Frair, Supervising Principal

Randolph Central, James F. Davis, District Principal

Salamanca Central, Paul E. Kirsch, Superintendent

West Valley Central, Clarence H. Clemens, Supervising Principal

BOCES - Cattaraugus County, Paul Haley, District Superintendent

Chautauqua County

Bemus Point Central, John B. Hillenbrand, Supervising Principal

Brocton Central, Thomas K. Sciarrino, Supervising Principal

Cassadaga Valley Central, Samuel Danton, Supervising Principal

Chautauqua Central, Roger Lane, Supervising Principal

Clymer Central, Hubert W. Brown, Supervising Principal

Dunkirk Public Schools, Robert Cooley, Superintendent of Schools

Falconer Central, James H. Gassman, Supervising Principal

Forestville Central, Thomas R. Marshall, Supervising Principal

Fredonia Central, Rocco R. Doino, Superintendent

Frewsburg Central, Harry J. Murray, Supervising Principal

Jamestown Public Schools, Harold O'Neal, Superintendent

Mayville Central, Harry H. Beno, Supervising Principal

Panama Central, Samuel E. Restivo, Supervising Principal

Pine Valley Central, Kenneth Christner, Supervising Principal

Ripley Central, Richard Freeman, Supervising Principal

Sherman Central, John Butler, Supervising Principal

Silver Creek Central, Don H. Gregory, Supervising Principal

Southwestern Central, Thomas R. Hasenpflug, Superintendent

Westfield Central, Paul J. Graig, Supervising Principal

BOCES - Chautauqua County, Philip L. LoGuidice, District Superintendent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION		PAGE
I.	The Problem	1
II.	Purpose of the Study	2
III.	The Population and the Sample	2
IV.	Hypothesis	4
V.	Methodology	4
VI.	Findings with Reference to School Induction Programs	6
VII.	Findings with Reference to Teachers' Attitudes	6
VIII.	Findings with Reference to Procedure and Methodology	10
IX.	Summary of Findings	11
X.	General and Tentative Conclusions	12
XI.	Recommendations Concerning Major Purposes of the Pilot Study	14
XII.	Recommendations Concerning Corollary Purposes of the Pilot Study	14
BIBLIOGRAPHY		16
APPENDIX A		
APPENDIX B		
APPENDIX C		

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	How Helpful Were Your Methods Courses in Preparation for Teaching?	7
II.	How Helpful Was Your Student Teaching in Preparing You to Teach?	8
III.	How Helpful Were Your Non-Education Courses in Preparing You to Teach?	9

A PILOT STUDY OF PROBLEMS AND PRACTICES IN THE INDUCTION OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

The Problem

Over one hundred years ago, Horace Mann in an address to prospective normal school graduates said, "More will sometimes be demanded of you than is reasonable" (NCTEPS, 1966, p. ii). Since then, much energy has been expended in the endeavor to extend and improve teacher training programs. Recently teacher training institutions and elementary and secondary schools have begun to focus on the problems of the neophyte teacher.

> Induction to teaching must be dealt with as a pertinent stage in career development. A new teacher should not be left to the isolation of his own classroom, to succeed or fail depending on his ability, ingenuity, and resilience. He should not be pressured into certain approaches to teaching merely because of the prevailing system or an imposed climate. He should be treated for what he is - a beginner - and be given the time and assistance he needs to develop his own teaching style (NCTEPS, p. vii).

The above protestations reflect honest concerns. However, the question must be asked, "How does one go about altering and improving the process of induction of beginning teachers into the profession?" In order to gain insight into the problems of induction, certain data collection procedures must be perfected which will yield valid information. Teacher training institutions have traditionally relied upon mailed questionnaire studies to provide the necessary feedback to guide their efforts for the improvement of the induction process. Unfortunately, although the reliability as measured by internal consistency is usually high, the validity of self-reporting instruments is often called into

question because they often suffer from errors of non-response and response bias.

An alternative data gathering procedure which has the potential of greater validity through reducing non-response as well as response bias is the utilization of a carefully developed interview schedule. This procedure holds forth the promise of achieving both the quality of questionnaire reliability and the potentially greater validity of the interview.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of the study were twofold: (1) To field-test and refine interview schedules and procedures designed to identify problems and practices in the induction of beginning teachers, and (2) To analyze and evaluate data secured in the Pilot Study for preparation and use of appropriate interview instruments and procedures for the comprehensive survey proposed for 1970.

Corollary purposes were to gain some tentative insight into induction problems and practices by interviewing a small sample of area teachers and school principals and to gain some insight as to: (1) means of planning and conducting effective interviews, (2) training requirements for interviewers, (3) organization and management problems involved in surveys which use interview techniques and (4) costs and efficiency factors.

The Population and the Sample

Information on the sample population or universe was obtained during the Winter of 1969 by asking all Chief School Officers in the Chautauqua-Cattaraugus County area to submit rosters of names and selected data of beginning teachers. Beginning teachers were defined as individuals who

have started their first professional year of teaching during 1968-69. From an original list of some 300 beginning teachers, all special area teachers at both elementary and secondary levels were eliminated, primarily because of limitations of time and resources in carrying out the study. The following special subject and service personnel were not included in the sample.

K - 6

Art
Physical Education
Music
Library
Speech and Reading Specialists
Guidance (Psychologist)
Nurse
Dental Hygienist
Media Specialists

7 - 12

Vocational Training
Homemaking
Art
Speech-Drama
Music (vocal and instrumental)
Librarian
Guidance Personnel
Dental Hygienist
Nurse
Business - Commercial
Physical Education
Speech and Reading Specialists
Driver Education
Media Specialists

In cases where the teachers were assigned to part-time "non-academic" subjects, they were included if the principal teaching role was in an academic area (e.g., English III and Driver Education). It is realized that this restriction poses some questions regarding the representativeness of the Pilot Study as regards all beginning teachers. Redefinition of the study population must be considered in the forthcoming major study.

A random cluster sample was selected from Instructional Units having beginning teachers. Owing to the exclusion of special subject-matter teachers, the sample of beginning teachers was comprised of elementary self-contained classroom teachers and secondary academic subject-matter teachers.

An "Instructional Unit" was defined as a part of or the total program within a school building. Categorization as Elementary (all or part of Grades K-6), Secondary (all or part of Grades 7-12), or Comprehensive (Grades K-12) is related to the scope of authority of the administrative officer interviewed. The Instructional Units thus included: self-contained Elementary Schools, Junior High, and Senior High Schools; Elementary and/or Secondary Units within a larger school; and Comprehensive (Grades K-12) Schools. Variations in school organization and types of schools represented in the sample are more explicitly described in Appendix B.

The Pilot Study sample included approximately 25 per cent of the universe of 79 schools and 25 per cent of the universe of 212 beginning teachers; 19 principals and 53 teachers comprised the sample.

Hypothesis

It was hypothesized that the interview technique of data gathering would secure more valid and useful information concerning induction problems and practices of beginning teachers than usual mailed questionnaire surveys. Questionnaire surveys are characterized by (1) high levels of non-responses, both instrument and item non-response, (2) a limited schedule of items of anticipatory relevance, and (3) uncritical acceptance of response biases usually in the direction of socially or professionally acceptable responses. Also, it was hypothesized that interviews would provide more information regarding item and question format as well as leads to additional questions than the usual mailed questionnaires.

Methodology

Interview schedules for both first-year teachers and principals were prepared and field-tested during the fall and winter terms of the academic year, 1968-69.

The general theme of the teacher interview schedule was to ascertain what help beginning teachers received in their efforts to fulfill the demands of the teacher role. The general theme of the principal's interview schedule was to ascertain what formal or informal programs existed in the school for facilitating the induction of first-year teachers into the profession. The teacher's schedule utilized a series of forced response items, some of which were followed by a number of open-end, probing questions designed to provide in-depth rationale as justification for their forced responses. The instrument used to obtain information with regard to school induction programs was entirely comprised of open-end questions directed at school principals.

Two training sessions were devoted to familiarizing interviewers (faculty wives and graduate students) with the interview schedule and also the use of tape recorders. Interviewers were then encouraged to practice the interview procedure during the following week. They were then brought back together for a final session in which minor changes were made in interview schedules. Interviewers received approximately five hours of formal training.

Continuous and discrete data were obtained from the forced response items. In addition, open-end responses were categorized and compared with forced responses for agreement and rationale. Audio recordings were obtained on interviews and parallel item responses were recorded on the interview schedules by the interviewers.

A record of per unit cost was kept for all expenditures in carrying out this interview study.

Findings with Reference to School Induction Programs

The interview schedule for principals, as prepared for and used in this study, was based on the assumption that if there were indeed a timed sequence of induction practices planned throughout the school year, data concerning these activities would be secured through the study. Data which were obtained indicated that little if any sequentially planned programs of induction of beginning teachers existed throughout the first year among the schools visited in the sample. Since such conditions existed, application of the schedule by the interviewers evoked a repetition of the few limited induction practices, both formal and informal, which were actually used among the schools in the sample. A complete summary of principals' responses to their questionnaire items is enclosed in Appendix B.

Findings with Reference to Teachers' Attitudes

In this section, text-tables are presented to illustrate the use of open-end responses to validate forced choice responses. More explicity, the tables are designed to show how open-end responses tended to transcend forced choice responses, thus allowing, for the accomplishment of methodoiogical purposes, critical analysis of data.

Table one indicates that had only the forced choice responses been considered, one would have been led to believe that 52 per cent of the teachers felt that methods courses were helpful in preparing them to

teach. However, when open-end responses were considered, most of the respondents who supported methods courses on forced choice questions qualified their position with certain non-supportive remarks. The data supported the assertion that open-end probing questions may provide information that can be used to validate forced choice responses.

TABLE I

"How helpful were your methods courses in preparation for teaching?"

Category	Percent
Supportive with No Reservations	8
Supportive with Certain Reservations	44
Total Supportive	52
Not Supportive with No Justification for the Response	8
Not Supportive with Justification for the Response	40
Total Not Supportive	48
Total	100

Table two indicates that on forced choice responses both elementary and secondary teachers (91 per cent and 83 per cent respectively) supported student teaching as being helpful in preparing them to teach. Again, when data obtained from probing questions were analyzed, 50 per cent and 18 per cent respectively had non-supportive reservations.

Table two also illustrates that as a group secondary teachers seemed to be less favorably inclined about the worth of their student teaching experiences than did elementary teachers. It should be noted, however, that the secondary teachers were disinclined to be either supportive or non-supportive without rationale, and that, as a group, they tended to be supportive of student teaching with positive rationale more often than the elementary teachers.

TABLE II

"How helpful was your student teaching experience in preparing you to teach?"

Category	Elementary Per Cent	Secondary Per Cent
Supportive with No Rationale	8	0
Supportive with Positive Rationale	33	65
Supportive with Reservations	50	18
Total Supportive	91	83
Not Supportive with No Rationale	0	0
Not Supportive with Rationale	9	17
Total Not Supportive	9	17
Total	100	100

Inasmuch as there was little difference between elementary and secondary teachers' responses with reference to attitudes toward the worth of non-education courses for preparing teachers for the job, Table three indicates only total group responses.

TABLE III

"How helpful were your non-education courses in preparing you to teach?"

Category	Percent
Supportive with No Rationale.....	3
Supportive with Positive Rationale.....	60
Supportive with Reservations.....	13
Total Supportive.....	76
Not Supportive with No Rationale.....	19
Not Supportive with Rationale.....	5
Total Not Supportive.....	24
Total.....	100

A general attitude of the respondents was that more courses in the cognitive fields pertinent to their specific subject-matter area in education should be offered in lieu of methods courses as they are now presented. Exemplary of these responses:

> "Well, all through college I felt that the different educational courses that we took ought to be combined into one good course. I thought maybe I'd change my mind once I got out and was teaching but I haven't."

> "More and more courses are needed I think by teachers in their field and their related field and less courses in education."

Findings with Reference to Procedure and Methodology

It has been asserted that the interview technique of data gathering has the potential for securing valid information because (1) non-response may be eliminated, (2) interviews are not limited to a set of items of anticipatory relevance, and (3) interviewing allows the researcher to critically analyze data in order to gain information which may transcend the usual forced choice response.

In carrying out this study, it became quite clear which factors may preclude the attainment of the above goals. For example, non-response was not eliminated, especially on open-end questions, because (1) occasionally the interviewers did not ask the question, (2) some open-end questions were ambivalent, were directed at behaviors which did not exist, or were directed at persons who could not or would not answer, (3) occasionally, audio recording equipment failed to function and (4) there was some evidence of interview bias. With more intensive training of interviewers and more reliability checks during the data collection period, these problems may be alleviated in the comprehensive study.

Even though there was high non-response error on some questions, open-end questions tended to yield unanticipated responses which were, in some cases, quite revealing. For instance, a number of respondents mentioned certain job related interpersonal problems which were quite troublesome to them even though the question was not asked per se.

Open-end responses also proved to be troublesome for the investigators to analyze. This, too, points up the need for a refinement of the instruments in order that questions may be structured in ways which will minimize the ambiguity of responses while still allowing for creative and unanticipated

answers. Questions dealing with problems mentioned frequently by respondents will undoubtedly be included in the revised interview schedules.

The cost of carrying out the Pilot Study using the random sampling procedure was approximately twenty dollars per unit. Using a simulated cost analysis based on the Pilot Study Population, it will be possible to estimate rather accurately the per unit cost of using either a random cluster sampling procedure or a simple random sampling procedure for the subsequent comprehensive study. At this juncture, the prospect for using a simple random sample looks favorable.

Both principals and beginning teachers generally indicated that the interview method of data gathering was an effective means of obtaining authentic information about the problems and practices of induction. More detailed data regarding both teachers' and principals' responses to the interviews may be found in Appendix A and B, respectively.

Summary of Findings

The notion of relevance (irrelevance) seemed to be the major determiner of teachers' attitudes toward pre-service training. Beginning teachers tended to look with favor upon any course as long as it was perceived as contributing to their effectiveness in the teaching role.

Ninety-five percent of the teachers interviewed admitted that they experienced considerable difficulty in performing their teaching roles, especially at the beginning of the school term. The preponderance of the response characterized the help received as a one day or one meeting orientation program conducted prior to the arrival of the students; these meetings were devoted to dissemination of information concerning general procedures and policies. Fifty-nine percent of the teachers stated that they would have preferred their teaching role to be more explicitly defined by:

(1) having been given more specific information on classroom procedures and management techniques; (2) having more problem-solving conferences with the principal or his designee; (3) having more observation and feedback on their classroom behavior; (4) having more consideration and help in obtaining materials and ideas for improvement of instructional techniques.

Feelings of satisfaction or disappointment seemed to be weighted primarily on the basis of teachers' perceptions of their ability to motivate students to learn. It seemed evident that the first-year teachers who were given groups of students who were potential drop-outs tended to see themselves as being ineffective motivators for learning; thus, they tended to suffer more disappointments than did others.

Most of the respondents expressed gratitude for the help that was offered by supervisors or colleagues but apparently assistance was not provided at the opportune time, thus, it was not as effective as it might have been.

In spite of the many problems encountered by beginning teachers, more than half indicated that they would like to remain in the same school, level, and subject matter area for the coming year.

Both principals and teachers indicated that they felt the interview procedure was an effective means of data gathering. For detailed frequency tabulations of teachers' responses to both forced choice and open-end questions, see Appendix A.

General and Tentative Conclusions:

1. First-year teachers seemed generally dissatisfied with the relevance of their pre-service training and also seemed dissatisfied with schools' induction programs.
2. Almost all beginning teachers reported a great many problems and difficulties in their initial teaching experiences, these persisted throughout the first year for many but were solved

or ameliorated by most -- probably resulting in many unknown and undetermined consequences for students and for teachers.

3. Principals recognized a need for better induction programs but time and resources seemed to restrict progress in this area.
4. Open-end probing questions tended to add validating information to forced-choice responses.
5. Insufficient training and monitoring of interviewers led to some non-response especially with open-end probing questions.
6. The interview procedure allowed for rather unlimited and creative responses which, in turn, allowed the investigators to probe beneath the socially or professionally "approved" type of response.
7. Incongruence between teachers' and principals' responses demands further study.
8. In spite of the comparatively high unit cost of the interview procedure, the greater amount and the greater validity of the information obtained warrants additional experimentation with the interview method in the context of the induction of beginning teachers.
9. The schedule prepared for interviewing principals in the Pilot Study was designed to secure data relating to a timed sequence of induction practices planned throughout the school year for beginning teachers. However, findings produced little evidence of such sequentially planned school programs of induction activities among schools visited in the sample. Data also indicated wide differences were attached to the meaning of "the induction process" and "supervision."

Recommendations Concerning Major Purposes of the Pilot Study

1. It is recommended that separate studies be planned and conducted to further investigate the incongruence revealed between principals' and teachers' responses in the Pilot Study. It appears to be feasible to schedule the teacher-oriented study, Induction Problems of Beginning Teachers for spring 1970, as originally planned. A fundamental departure from the Pilot Study approach, however, appears to be required for the planning and implementation of the principal-oriented study. It is proposed that the latter study be directed toward the study of supervisory practices employed among area schools for the induction of beginning teachers without primary concern for the formal or informal nature of these practices or the sequence in which they are provided. Suggested time-lines are as follows:

   Preparation of questionnaires, interview schedules, and observation instruments during spring and summer 1970; field-testing and revising instruments in fall 1970; conducting pilot study spring 1971.

2. In the main study, consideration should be given to broadening the population to include all beginning teachers in all subject-matter areas. It is possible that the population should be extended beyond Chautauqua and Cattaraugus counties.
3. There is a need to explore the consequences of teachers' methods of coping with their problems in induction.

Recommendations Concerning Corollary Purposes of the Pilot Study

1. The interview schedules presently used in the Pilot Study should be carefully analyzed and revised for more effective utilization in the comprehensive study contemplated for the Spring of 1970.

2. A more intensive preparation of interviewers who will conduct the study among area schools should be conducted prior to the undertaking of the forthcoming comprehensive study.
3. The revised interview schedule should be prepared in sufficient time to permit a limited field test before utilization in the comprehensive study.
4. The cost of carrying out the Pilot Study using the random cluster sampling procedure was approximately twenty dollars per unit. Based on a simulated cost projection, using random sampling procedures, it is estimated that the per unit cost of the major study should not greatly exceed that of the Pilot Study. However, an alternate plan is being considered where college students may be employed as interviewers. This possibility will be field tested and if students demonstrate the desired degree of competence, the interviewing costs may be reduced by as much as forty or fifty percent.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Davies, Vernon. "A Rapid Method for Determining the Significance of the Difference Between Two Percentages." A Set of Tables Prepared by the Author when he was in the Washington Agricultural Experiment Stations Department of Rural Sociology, n.d. (Mimeographed.)

National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. The Real World of the Beginning Teacher. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association of the United States, 1966.

APPENDIX A

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF TEACHERS' INTERVIEW DATA

	Elementary Percent	Secondary Percent	Total Group Percent
1. Age (years):			
20-24	80	78	79
25-29	20	14	17
30 and over	0	8	4
2. Sex:			
Men	28	54	42
Women	72	46	58
3. Home State:			
New York	60	64	62
Pennsylvania	32	32	32
Kentucky	4	0	2
Ohio	4	0	2
Michigan	0	4	2
4. Training Institution:			
SUNY, Fredonia	40	36	37
N.Y. Other	8	29	18
Out of State	52	35	45
5. County Where Teaching:			
Chautauqua County	80	64	71
Cattauragus County	20	36	29
6. Level of Teaching:			
Primary	52		25
Intermediate	48		23
Jr. High		14	7
Sr. High		18	9
Jr. and Sr. High Combination		68	36
7. Major Subject:			
Elem. General	52		24
Elem. History	4		2
Elem. Art	8		4
Elem. English	8		4
Special Educ.	4		2
Elem. P E	4		2
Elem. Math	4		2
Elem. Soc. St.	12		6
Elem. Sci.	4		2

	Elementary Percent	Secondary Percent	Total Group Percent
Language Arts (Secondary)		25	13
Math "		21	11
Science "		11	6
Soc. St. "		21	11
Fgn. Lang. "		22	11
8. Marital status			
Single, not expecting marriage within year	44	47	45
Single, expecting marriage within year	12	25	19
Married, no children	12	14	13
Married, children or expecting	28	14	21
Widowed, divorced, or separated	4	0	2
9. What is the highest level of education you expect to complete?			
Less than four years of college	0	0	0
Four years or B.A. degree	12	0	6
One year graduate school or M.A.	80	68	73
Two years graduate study	0	11	6
Doctoral degree	8	21	15
10. Father's (or step-father's) highest educational level			
8th grade or less	20	18	19
Part high school-	28	29	28
High school graduate	28	25	26
Part college	12	14	14
College graduate (4 years)	12	7	9
Higher degree	0	7	4
11. Mother's (or step-mother's) highest educational level			
8th grade or less	0	7	4
Part high school	12	25	19
High school graduate	60	43	50
Part college	20	21	21
College graduate (4 years)	8	4	6
Higher degree	0	0	0
12. Father's Occupation			
Unskilled worker, laborer, farm worker	12	11	11
Semiskilled worker (e.g., machine operator)	28	11	19
Service worker (policeman, fireman, barber, military non-commissioned officer, etc.)	8	7	8

	Elementary Percent	Secondary Percent	Total Group Percent
Skilled worker or craftsman (carpenter, electrician, etc.).....	12	25	19
Salesman, bookkeeper, secretary, office worker, etc.	12	14	13
Owner, manager, partner of a small business; farm operator or manager; lower level government official; military commissioned officer.....	24	14	19
Profession requiring a bachelor's degree (engineer, elementary or secondary teacher, etc.).....	4	14	9
Owner, high-level executive--large business or high-level government agency.....	0	0	0
Professional requiring an advanced college degree (doctor, lawyer, college professor, etc.).....	0	4	2
13. Income category for your parental family			
Less than $5,000 per year.....	0	4	2
$5,000 - $7,499.....	16	7	11
$7,500 - $9,999.....	20	18	19
$10,000 - $14,999.....	40	42	42
$15,000 - $19,999.....	8	14	11
$20,000 - $30,000.....	4	4	4
Over $30,000.....	0	4	2
I have no idea.....	12	7	9
14. Describes the community			
Farm or open country.....	24	25	25
Suburb in a metropolitan area of -			
more than 2 million population...	0	4	2
500,000 to 2 million.....	8	0	4
100,000 to 499,999.....	0	0	0
less than 100,000.....	12	11	11
Central city in a metropolitan area, city, or community of more than 2 million population.....	0	0	0
500,000 to 2 million.....	0	4	2
100,000 to 499,999.....	4	4	4
50,000 to 99,000.....	0	0	0
10,000 to 49,000.....	44	31	37
Less than 10,000.....	8	21	15
15. Older brothers or sisters			
None.....	60	39	49
One.....	32	46	40
Two.....	8	11	9
Three or more.....	0	4	2

	Elementary Percent	Secondary Percent	Total Group Percent
16. Younger brothers or sisters			
None	32	50	41
One	28	18	23
Two	16	25	21
Three or more	24	7	15
17. How helpful were your methods courses in preparation for teaching?			
1. Very helpful	24	24	24
2. Quite helpful	32	24	28
3. Of little help	44	32	38
4. Of no help	0	20	10
17.1 Discuss value of methods courses, suggestions for improvement, relevance for present assignment, etc.			
1. Supportive with no reservations			8
2. Supportive with certain reservations			44
3. Not supportive with no justification for response			8
4. Not supportive with justification for response			40
18. How helpful was your student teaching experience in preparing you to teach?			
1. Very helpful	69	71	70
2. Quite helpful	22	12	17
3. Of little help	9	17	13
4. Of no help	0	0	0
18.1 Discuss value of student teaching experience, suggestions for improvement, relevance to present assignment, etc.			
1. Supportive with no rationale	8	0	4
2. Supportive with positive rationale	33	65	49
3. Supportive with reservations	50	18	34
4. Not supportive with no rationale	0	0	0
5. Not supportive with rationale	9	17	13
19. How helpful where your non-education courses in preparing you to teach?			
1. Very helpful	38	56	47
2. Quite helpful	33	26	29
3. Of little help	29	18	24
4. Of no help	0	0	0

	Elementary Percent	Secondary Percent	Total Group Percent
19.1 Discuss value of non-education courses, suggestions for improvement, relevance to present assignment, etc.			
1. Supportive with no rationale			3
2. Supportive with positive rationale			60
3. Supportive with reservations			13
4. Not supportive with no rationale			19
5. Not supportive with rationale			5
20. How ready were you to begin your present teaching assignment?			
1. Well prepared	19	20	20
2. Not well prepared	30	28	29
3. Could not or did not answer	51	52	51
20.1 What did you do to prepare for your present teaching assignment?			
1. Worked primarily with instructional materials			45
2. Worked primarily with colleagues, administrators and office personnel			8
3. Both 1 and 2 above			12
4. Did nothing			27
5. Could not or did not answer			8
20.2 What were the most important problems encountered?			
1. Adjustment to students' behavior (Unrealistic expectations of students)	20	33	25
2. Discipline	32	19	25
3. Difficulty in adapting instructional materials to needs of students	0	19	10
4. General classroom management procedures	32	22	27
5. No problems	12	0	6
6. Could not or did not answer	4	7	7
20.3 How did you work out a solution to these problems:			
1. Attempted to work individually with students	24	30	27
2. Elicited help from administrators or colleagues	24	22	23
3. Introspection and self-preparation	4	30	17
4. Trial and error; no systematic plan	32	4	18
5. Could not or did not answer	16	14	15

	Elementary Percent	Secondary Percent	Total Group Percent
21. What kinds of help did you get in starting your work here or in this building? For example:			
21.1 Who helped you?			
1. Administrators and supervisors			25
2. Colleagues			63
3. Office staff			4
4. Nobody			6
5. Could not or did not answer			2
21.2 When did you receive help?			
1. Short formal orientation program			28
2. Helped on a continuing basis			33
3. No help at any time			6
4. Could not or did not answer			33
21.3 In what way were you helped?			
1. Social orientation (e.g., met persons in the community and toured the community	4	7	5
2. Task oriented (e.g., received instructions on classroom management, helped in obtaining materials)	36	23	30
3. Both social and job oriented (1 and 2 above)	20	26	23
4. No help received	12	7	10
5. Could not or did not answer	28	37	32
21.4 Organized or informal program?			
1. Brief formal program	12	26	20
2. Brief informal program	40	22	30
3. Formal ongoing program	0	0	0
4. Informal ongoing program	20	22	21
5. Could not or did not answer	28	30	29
21.5 How did you feel about the help?			
1. Sufficient			27
2. Insufficient			50
3. Ambivalent			6
4. Could not or did not answer			17
21.6 What other kinds of help should have been given you?			
1. More explicit communication of role expectations			46
2. More consideration on the part of the administration			13
3. No help needed other than what was given			13
4. Could not or did not answer			28

	Elementary Percent	Secondary Percent	Total Group Percent
22. In general how satisfied were you with the assistance you have received in getting started in your first year of teaching?			
1. Highly satisfied.....	63	31	46
2. Generally satisfied.....	25	34	30
3. Mixed satisfaction and dissatisfaction.....	12	12	12
4. Generally dissatisfied.....	0	15	8
5. Highly dissatisfied.....	0	8	4

23. What do you feel you are getting out of teaching?	
1. Satisfactions depend on one's ability to motivate students to learning.....	75
2. Other.....	25

24. If you had the opportunity to go back to the decision point of teaching - would you do it again?	
1. Yes.....	71
2. No.....	5
3. Could not or did not answer.....	24
24.1 Decision point of teacher preparation in college?	
1. During high school or younger.....	26
2. During undergraduate program.....	27
3. Could not or did not answer.....	47
24.2 Decision point for taking first job?	
1. During undergraduate program.....	25
2. Could not or did not answer.....	75
24.3 Would you teach the same level and same subject (next year)?	
1. Yes.....	56
2. No.....	29
3. Could not or did not answer.....	15

24.4 What would you have done if you had not gone into teaching?

No specific occupation or profession was listed with high frequency.

	Elementary Percent	Secondary Percent	Total Group Percent
25. What are your intentions about teaching next year.			
1. I definitely will not teach next year	17	15	16
2. Strong possibility I will not teach next year	0	0	0
3. I am undecided about teaching next year	4	0	2
4. Strong possibility I will teach next year	12	4	8
5. I definitely will teach next year	67	81	74

25.1 If you do not plan to teach next year, or if there is a possibility you will not, what are your plans for next year? (N=8)

1. Graduate school	24
2. Undecided	50
3. Will rear family	13
4. Will go into business administration training	13

25.2 What are your intentions about making a career in Education?

1. I definitely will not make my career in Education	0	4	2
2. Strong possibility I will not make my career in Education	0	0	0
3. I am undecided about making my career in Education	8	19	14
4. Strong possibility I will make my career in Education	42	44	43
5. I definitely will make my career in Education	50	33	41

25.3 What are your long range career plans?

1. Rear family then return to Teaching (females)	19
2. Attain advanced degrees	50
3. Could not or did not answer	31

26. How did you feel about this interview?

1. Would like to have had questions in advance	19
2. Felt it was an important project and hoped it would help beginning teachers	12
3. Generally pleased - not specific	54
4. Could not or did not answer	15

	Elementary Percent	Secondary Percent	Total Group Percent
26.1 What suggestions do you have for improving this interview?			
1. State purposes more clearly			2
2. Omit the tape recorder			2
3. Gear interview to what happened early in the school year			2
4. More time needed for answering probing questions			2
5. Have two interviews: one early and one late in the school year			2
6. I was <u>told</u> to appear for interview			2
7. Ask more specific probing questions			2
8. Could not or did not answer			86
27. Discuss general reactions to your first year of teaching.			
1. Generally satisfied and looking forward with confidence to next year			43
2. Ambivalent about first year of teaching yet looking with increased confidence to next year			25
3. Felt poorly prepared to teach the level and subject assigned-not very confident about future teaching experience			14
4. Dissatisfied with the "system"; however, enjoyed working with children			6
5. Could not or did not answer			12

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPALS' INTERVIEW DATA

I. Variations in Organization Among the Nineteen Instructional Units

Level of Instructional Unit	No. Instructional Units	Title of Administrative Officer
Elementary (all or part of K-6)	10	Elementary Principal*
Secondary (all or part of 7-12)	6	High School Principal (4)
		J.H. School Principal (2)
Comprehensive (K-12)	3	Supervisory Principal
Total	19	

*Includes one Head Teacher

Types of School System Represented Among the Nineteen Instructional Units

Unit is Part of	
Independent City School System	7
Other Independent Superintendency	1
Central Schools in County	--
Supervisory District	11
Total	19

II. General Information

Since the purpose of the interview items under General Information was to gain an overview of the setting of the Instructional Units included in the sample rather than the acquisition of accurate information on grade enrollments, numbers of teachers, and numbers of beginning teachers, such data are not reported here. Of interest in the study, however, are the following comments drawn from the data:

Number of pupils in school:

While it is general practice-presumably because of bedgetary definitions-to consider Grades K-6 as Elementary and Grades 7-12 as Secondary, assignment of pupils in attendance units included in the study revealed some differences among schools. Illustrative of such differences are the following:

1. "Junior High" may refer to Grades 7-8 or Grades 7-9; "Elementary" may refer to K-6, K-5, or Prekindergarten-elementary.

2. Responsibility for elementary pupils located in one Junior High School was divided among two administrators: J.H. Principal for housing, management; El. Coordinator for curriculum.

3. Responsibility for Prekindergarten classes in one system was accorded to the Elementary Principal.

Number of Teachers

Several principals, despite admonitions not to include administrative personnel, non-teaching specialists or paraprofessionals, in reporting the number of teachers in their Instructional Units, persisted in reporting guidance personnel and other non-instructional staff as teachers. Better definitions of distinctions among the various categories of school personnel appear to be indicated.

Number of Beginning Teachers

Despite the definition of "beginning teacher" used in the Pilot Study: "a professionally prepared individual employed by the school and in his (her) first year of teaching children," some principals reported as "beginning teachers" experienced individuals who were "new" to their system.

"How many professional administrators are there in this building and what are their respective responsibilities?"

Elementary Units

Six of the ten units identified as "Elementary" reported having a professional elementary principal or elementary supervisor. Among the remaining four, administrative and supervisory leadership was provided through head teachers who taught full time or through shared services of a systemwide elementary school principal or supervisor.

Responsibilities reported by elementary administrators and/or supervisors ranged from such global responses as,

Educational leadership.
Maintenance and control,
Personnel
Safety
Discipline

OR

More management than educational leadership.
Administer building, supervise program.

To such specific statements as, "ten days are available to me for supervision and administrative responsibility throughout the year through the use of substitutes."

Secondary Units

All six (Junior High and Senior High) secondary units reported the presence of a principal; additional help in administration and supervision was provided through assistants, vice principals, directors of instruction, and department chairmen, in all but one of the secondary units.

Responsibilities reported by the principals included:

Educational leadership
Curriculum and educational planning
Classroom supervision and operation of building

Vice principals were reported to have responsibility for such things as:

Student activities
Discipline

In one unit which included department chairmen, these individuals were reported as having responsibility for classroom instruction, curriculum changes, and supervision of the academic program while the principal assumed responsibility for supervision of the building.

Comprehensive Units

The administrative officers of the comprehensive units (K-12) were all supervising principals. These three school officers in the sample reported such responsibilities for the overall school system as:

Each had a high school principal as an assistant who was responsible for the program for either grades 7-12 or for the 9-12 program.

One of the chief school officers reported the part time services of an elementary school principal for grades K-6.

No additional specific responsibilities were reported by the chief school officers (supervising principals) other than the system wide commitments mentioned above.

"How much time is given by building supervisors to supervision of instruction in your building and how is this done?"

Elementary Units

Responses of elementary principals indicate that either a wide range exists in the amount of time devoted to supervision of instruction among the elementary units sampled or there is considerable difference as to the interpretation of "supervision of instruction." Where specific estimates of percents were given, principals' estimates ranged from ten percent to fifty percent of their total time as being devoted to supervisory activities. Other estimates of time devoted to such responsibilities included the following:

Three times a year - 30 minutes each.
Ten days during the school year - visitation with classes and teachers,
Principal spends most of his day supervising elementary school teachers and instruction.

Other more global responses included: "Make observations"; "Not enough." As to how supervision is accomplished, the following activities were reported: Class visitations, workshops, teacher conferences, in-service workshops, teacher visits to principal.

Secondary Units

One secondary principal reported spending fifty percent of his time in formal and informal classroom supervision. Another principal reported spending as much as one or two periods daily in classroom supervision.

Where teacher performance review is employed, practices vary widely. In one secondary unit each teacher is reviewed twice yearly through observation of classes and individual teacher conferences. In another unit, probationary teachers are observed three times yearly, twice by the department head and once by the principal. One of the most explicit plans of supervision was recorded as follows:

"Most supervision of instruccion is performed by department heads; department heads meet with the principal on a regular basis. Department heads visit beginning teachers three times yearly. Teachers beyond that are visited at least four times and those on tenure at least two times. Department heads sit in on an entire period, prepare reports in triplicate for self, principal and teacher and have conferences with teachers."

Comprehensive Units

Chief School Officers reported supervisory activities as follows: one day orientation on first day of school with the distribution of a detailed handbook; meetings twice a year with teachers coming up for tenure; faculty meetings; individual meetings relating to some particular aspect; observation.

"How much time is spent and what is done in supervising instruction by the school system staff?"

Elementary Units

Only two units reported supervision of instruction by school system staff other than the building principals; this usually takes place some time before the teachers are placed on tenure. School system staffs, however, were reported as providing a variety of supportive services such as grade level meetings during the year; the formation and meeting of school wide committee meetings to study new texts; periodic administrative staff meetings. One principal stated, "if the principal doesn't supervise, no one does."

Secondary Units

Responses indicated that little, if any, supervision of instruction is provided other than by the administrators, supervisors and department chairmen located within the units. One reference was made to the secondary coordinator of instruction as being responsible for instruction in three junior high schools and one senior high school unit; this responsibility includes some teacher observation.

Comprehensive Units

Chief School Officers indicated a variety of responses including: supervision being offered as often as needed; 90 percent of time devoted to supervision of instruction - including curriculum development; working with teachers; selection of texts and supplementary materials; establishment of room libraries in K-12; supervising teachers who are coming up for tenure at least twice yearly.

III. Induction Procedures

"Discuss induction of teachers - our definition: "what is done to help beginning teachers in meeting their professional responsibilities."

"Do you have any formal induction procedures for beginning teachers prior to the beginning of school?"

Elementary Units

Responses indicate general practices in holding meetings with new teachers on the first day of school or shortly before that time. These meetings may be system wide or held by each unit principal. About half the principals reported distribution of school handbooks to staff members during these meetings. Other induction practices include tours of city and area, breakfasts and luncheons for beginning teachers.

Among the purposes of such meetings were the following: social introductions; orienting the staff to the community; familiarization of staff with materials, facilities and schedules; familiarizing the staff with rules and regulations of the school and school system; provision of information on retirement. Use of the "buddy system" frequently mentioned.

Secondary Units

Secondary principals reported such practices as the following: meeting with new teachers; bringing in department heads to meet with new teachers; distributing handbooks; tour of school building; orientation by school administration.

Comprehensive Units

Chief School Officers reported, in one instance, meeting with new teachers once weekly for the first five weeks; distribution of handbooks; use of the "buddy system"; tours of school system.

"Any informal induction procedures for beginning teachers prior to the beginning of school?"

Elementary Units

Informal induction procedures most frequently reported included: the "buddy system"; informal talks with other teachers and principals; the "open door policy" to the principal's office; social event at chief administrator's home.

Secondary Units

Secondary principals reported the following informal induction practices: "open door policy"; meetings with new teachers and teachers associations members; faculty picnic; distribution of bulletins on materials and equipment; extending invitations to prospective new teachers to visit school classes to observe; delay of classroom visitation by the principal during the first month to encourage new teachers to come to him; use of the "buddy system."

Comprehensive Units

Chief School Officers reported the following informal induction procedures: informal interviews; tour of the school; previews of expected schedules; distribution of school texts before the opening of school; helping new teachers find proper housing; encouragement of new teachers to ask for assistance when needed.

IV. Assignments for beginning teachers

"How, when, and what kinds of assignments are made for beginning teachers?"

Elementary Units

Responses of elementary school principals indicated considerable variations in practices. In some schools, assignment is by the coordinator of elementary school development; in other systems, assignments are made through the office - teachers are usually assigned to the grades they request; teachers are assigned to particular grades and rooms in the spring but changes are possible during the summer. Teachers are hired and assigned by certification and past experience. Individual teachers with special interests are asked to share these interests with groups.

Other responses indicated interest in communicating rules and regulations to new teachers such as: time of arrival for class; assignment of playground duty; assignment of extra responsibility as soon as hired.

Secondary Units

Five of the secondary school principals who responded to this question gave some indication of awareness of the need to assign lighter loads to inexperienced teachers. The following were among the responses made: teachers usually are assigned introductory courses; an effort is made not to assign discipline problems to new teachers; no teachers are assigned to clubs - teachers may request assignment to clubs which may include extra pay; teachers have smaller class loads as a rule; new teachers have a study hall assignment included in their total loads.

Comprehensive Units

Chief School Officers varied in response concerning the assigning of new teachers. These included: new teachers received lightest assignments; all assignments are equal - whether new or old teachers, new teachers share study hall duties, chaperone at games; principal tries to limit their activities but usually needs each teacher for various extra activities.

"Are there any special consideration in the assignment of new teachers?"

Elementary Units

Elementary principals indicated the following among the special considerations given to new teachers in making assignments: efforts are made to assign new teachers with experienced teachers as "buddies"; new teachers who have special fields usually get to teach those fields; consideration is given to student teaching, personality and flexibility; consideration is given to grade level requested by new teachers.

Secondary Units

Secondary principals generally reported making an effort to assign new teachers to the grade levels and subjects they wanted; assigning smaller class

Secondary Units (continued)

loads with no extra assignments; keeping new teachers off extra curriculum responsibilities and special committees; one principal attempted to provide relief by removing responsibility for discipline by requesting new teachers to send disciplinary problems to the office.

Comprehensive Units

Chief School Officers varied in their responses: one expressed the feeling that both new and experienced teachers should be treated equally in assignment; the other two respondees felt that new teachers should be assigned easier to teach and better groups of children.

"Typically, are assignments changed or revised after the school year starts, and if so, under what circumstances?"

Elementary Units

Responses of elementary principals indicated considerable variation in philosophy. Some felt that such changes had never been necessary and that a problem would have to be very severe to bring about such changes in assignment. Most felt, however, that if in their opinion, there was a need for such changes, this would be made. Where such changes are made, they appear to be made only after efforts are taken to correct the problem underlying a request or need for change in assignment. Reasons given for possible changes in assignment appear to be rather dramatic and included: changes made for the mutual benefit of children and teacher; illness or death. Some principals' reports indicated that requested changes in assignment made by teachers would be considered; however, implementation of these changes is usually delayed until the end of the year.

Secondary Units

Secondary principals reported that changes in assignment are very rarely made. Such changes may be made if necessary for teachers with too heavy work loads, family commitments, and the like. However, on teacher request, minor changes in assignments such as changes in schedule and study hall may occasionally be made.

Comprehensive Units

Chief school officers varied in their responses to this question. One indicated there were many changes in assignment wherever there were control problems. Another chief school officer indicated that if teachers could not handle assignments for one reason or another, the possibility of change was entertained. The third respondee indicated that changes in assignment very seldom occurred but could be effected in extra curricular responsibilities for the convenience of teachers upon their request.

V. General Reaction to Interview

"How did you feel about this interview?"

Elementary Units

All but one of the principals (who failed to respond) indicated good feelings concerning the interview, that the questions were relevant and that the subject was interesting. Two responses indicated that questions were repetitive and that some difficulty was encountered in utilizing the tape recorder.

Secondary Units

Seconday principals indicated that they felt that the interview was good and that questions appeared to be relevant to the topic of induction of beginning teachers. One principal expressed the wish that more could be done to assist beginning teachers.

Comprehensive Units

Chief school officers expressed the opinion that the interview offered a means to provide a better understanding of the problems facing beginning teachers; that valuable information would be available through the study of school and college personnel involved in the preparation of teachers; and that an opportunity to examine the results would be appreciated.

"Did we miss any important things?"

Elementary units

Elementary Principals had no suggestions for adding items to the interview schedule. One or two indicated that they had failed to speak about such topics as introductions of teachers to the staff, the role of the parent teachers association. A few principals used this occasion to express their thoughts that the colleges should better prepare teachers in such matters as public relation information, better communication, better relationships with other older teachers and the staff, and better discipline.

Secondary Units

Several Secondary Principals did not respond to this item either because the interview was cut off or because the interviewer never asked this question. One principal indicated he had no real complaints about his new teachers. Another used the occasion to indicate that reports of practice teachers' supervisors are too sketchy. He expressed his concern at the lack of a program for working with beginning teachers.

Comprehensive Units

Two of the Chief School Officers had no comments. The other respondee indicated some concern that the shortage of teachers was compelling school districts to hire non-experienced personnel and to pay people to learn on the job.

"What suggestions do you have for improving this interview procedure?"

Elementary Units

Six of the ten elementary principals had no comment to make. Other individual comments included the following: prior knowledge of the interview would have been helpful in anticipating answers; questions should be less ambigious; turning off the tape recorder would provide the interviewee time to think; better tape recorders should be used.

Secondary Units

Only one of the secondary principals had specific comments to make as follows: "I don't know if we hit all the questions; I've not had too much experience with new inductees; I would like a copy of the report when it is completed."

Comprehensive Units

Responses from the Chief School Officers included the following: preference for a person to person interview rather than a written interview; no suggestions; would like to see results of study.

Tentative Conclusions

1. The interview schedule as prepared for and used in the Pilot Study, is based on the assuption that if there were indeed a timed sequence of induction practices planned throughout the school year, data concerning these activities would be secured through the study. Data which were obtained indicated that little if any sequentially planned program of induction of beginning teachers existed throughout the first year among the schools visited in the sample. Since such conditions existed, application of the schedule by the interviewers was devoted to a repetition of the few limited induction practices, both formal and informal, which were actually used among the schools in the sample. This suggests that some revision of the interview schedule for principals is indicated; this schedule should be made less repetitive in terms of a timed sequence of induction activities and should perhaps probe in greater depth as to what takes place in classroom visitation, individual teacher conferences, and other supervisory practices. A better definition of actual supervision also appears to be indicated to exclude the possibility of confusing the term with such practices as area teachers' conferences, general staff meetings, etc.

2. Additional training of interviewers appears to be indicated. It is noted, from an examination of the data, that interviewers frequently did not pursue a question or did, in fact, omit some questions entirely.

3. There seems to be little question that schools in the pilot study exhibit much more verbalized concern about the problems and practices involved in the induction of teachers than the activities they undertake in connection with induction would indicate.

Tentative Conclusions (continued)

4. There appears to be considerable confusion as to the difference between formal and informal induction practices. Other areas of confusion seem to bring about some confusion as to what is basically meant by the induction of teachers. It is proposed that in any revised interview schedule for administrators, some attention be focused upon differentiating the social, "rules and regulations" information procedures, and community orientation facets of "induction" from the professional needs of the beginning teacher and the efforts of the local school to accommodate these teachers.

Recommendation

It is recommended that separate studies be planned and conducted to further investigate the incongruence revealed between principals' and teachers' responses in the Pilot Study. It appears to be feasible to schedule the teacher-oriented study, Induction Problems of Beginning Teachers for spring 1970, as originally planned. A fundamental departure from the Pilot Study approach, however, appears to be required for the planning and implementation of the principal-oriented study. It is proposed that the latter study be directed toward the study of supervisory practices employed among area schools for the induction of beginning teachers without primary concern for the formal or informal nature of these practices or the sequence in which they are provided. Suggested time-lines are as follows: preparation of questionnaires, interview schedules, and observation instruments during spring and summer 1970; field-testing and revising instruments in fall 1970; conducting pilot study spring 1971.

APPENDIX C

TABLE 2

Comparison of Sample Groups with Population on Selected Data Categories

Category		Random Sample %	Random Cluster Sample %	Population %
Age:	20 - 24.....	74	79	71
	25 - 29.....	15	17	19
	30 and over.....	11*	4*	10
Sex:	Males.....	36	42	42
	Females.....	64	58	58
Training Institution:				
	SUC - Fredonia.....	30	38	36
	N.Y. Other.....	30	19	25
	Out of State.....	40	43	39

* $P > .05$ but $P < .10$; all other comparisons were $P > .10$.

A technique for determining the significance of difference between percentages (Davies, n.d.) was used to indicate the significance level of the difference between the above population parameter and sample statistics. Based on the statistical comparison of the groups as shown above, the investigators believe the samples are comparable and are representative of the population.